DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 226 CS 208 273

AUTHOR Salmon, Caryn C.; And Others
TITLE Satisfaction with the Advertising Agency: From the Advertisers' Perspective.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (67th, Gainesville, FL, August 5-8, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advertising; *Business; Competence; *Interaction; Interpersonal Competence; Job Performance; *Media Research
IDENTIFIERS *Advertising Agencies; *Client Satisfaction

ABSTRACT

Based on the idea that the relationship between a client and its advertising agency is primarily a "people" relationship, a study was undertaken to examine the factors that influence a client's satisfaction with its agency, particularly in the day-to-day, or maintenance, phase of the relationship. Data were taken from responses given by 182 advertisers to a mail questionnaire that asked them to rate several maintenance and task factors that might influence their satisfaction with their advertising agencies. Results showed that a surprisingly large number of advertisers (51%) was dissatisfied with their agencies, suggesting a lack of understanding between the two organizations. Organization size and advertising budget influenced the importance ratings of maintenance and task issues, with smaller companies with smaller budgets more concerned with the success of the agency in handling task issues such as creative work or research, and larger organizations more concerned with maintenance or relationship issues. Regularly scheduled reviews of agency work were more often carried out by organizations with larger rather than smaller budgets. Finally, the results indicated that advertisers that had been allowed to choose their agencies--as opposed to using one chosen by a parent company, for example--were more satisfied with the work of that agency. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED245226

Advertising Division

Satisfaction With the Advertising Agency: From the Advertisers' Perspective

Caryn C. Salmon
Account Executive
Pringle Dixon Pringle
3340 Peachtree Rd. NE
Atlanta, GA

Charles T. Salmon
Assistant Professor
School of Journalism and Mass Comunication
University of Georgia
Athens, GA

Daniel B. Wackman
Professor
School of Journalism and Mass Communication
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Daniel B. Wackman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 208273

Abstract

The factors that influence an advertiser's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with an advertising agency are becomining increasingly important to both parties.

This study offers a conceptual framework for understanding the agency-client relationship and describes the results of a survey of 182 advertising executives. In this survey, respondents were asked to evaluate their satisfaction with their present agency and to rate several factors that might influence their satisfaction with the agency.

The results indicate that maintenance issues--issues that are concerned with day-to-day interactions between agency and client account personnel--are perceived as very important to clients. Respondents from companies with large advertising budgets tend to rate certain maintenance issues as more important than task issues--the actual strategies and techniques used by the agency.

Satisfaction With the Advertising Agency: From the Advertisers' Perspective

The factors that influence an advertiser's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with an advertising agency are becoming increasingly important to both parties. For example, a recent Advertising Age Editorial Sounding Board Poll of agency and client executives found that six out of ten respondents said they expect that conflicts in the agency-advertiser relationship will become more frequent in the future (Zelter 1984). This figure is particularly alarming in light of the fact that since the mid-60's, the rate of switches among large client organizations has increased, averaging an estimated 250 per year (Garfield 1981).

The present study examines the factors that influence the advertiser's satisfaction with the agency, particularly focusing on the importance of the day-to-day working relationship between representatives of both the agency and client organizations. The study is based on the notion that advertising is primarily a "people" business; if the interpersonal relationship between key account personnel is productive, then the productivity of advertising will be maximized (Weilbacher 1981).

A Conceptual Framework for the Agency-Client Relationship

The agency-client relationship can be considered to be a form of an instrumental relationship, a system which has as its ultimate function the performance of some task (Bennis, Schein, Steele & Berlew 1968). According to this perspective, this relationship system has two needs, each of which must be met to some minimum degree if the system is to continue.

The first need involves task issues which include such areas as goals, strategies and the actual implementation of activities by both parties in the

relationship. Task issues involve technical or content aspects of the job itself as well as the area of structure or division of labor. The task issues initially provide the impetetus for the instrumental relationship, since the relationship has been formed for some specific function, i.e., to perform some task. The second need involves maintenance issues, i.e., the "chemistry" between both parties and the process of mutual evaluation. These issues refer to the socioemotional state of the relationship and specifically to aspects of the relationship itself and feelings of each partner toward the other.

Neither type of issue alone will ensure the success or demise of a work relationship, but each is affected reciprocally by the other. That is, maintenance issues, such as the chemistry between the two parties, will partially determine the dyad's effectiveness in resolving task issues which, in turn, will influence each party's perceptions of each other, a maintenance issue. Significantly, problems with both task and maintenance issues can be resolved only through communication, a continual feedback process between both parties.

Generally, effectiveness in these work relationships increases as behavior is rational, logical and clearly communicated (Argyris 1968). In addition, a balance of power and a general atmosphere of trust between both parties will form a situation in which productivity is encouraged and creativity can flourish (Bennis et. al 1968).

Relationship Phases in the Agency-Client Relationship

The instrumental relationship, generally, the agency-client relationship, specifically (and in fact, every relationship), can be viewed as basically going through three distinct phases: pre-relationship, maintenance and termination. In the pre-relationship phase, both parties are learning about and testing each other. If this phase is successful, the parties go through a

period of orienation and adjustment in the maintenance phase, a period in which each tries to live up to the claims they made in the early stages of the relationship. Finally, every relationship goes through a termination process, either voluntarily or involuntarily.

While this relationship framework clearly applies to many interpersonal settings, it is particularly useful in examining agency-client interactions. The agency-client relationship has been likened to a conjugal relationship (Morgan 1974; Salmon 1984), a situation in which both parties typically enter into a partnership with the expectations of maintaining a long-term commitment and either maintain the relationship by learning the importance of mutual communication, understanding and trust or are forced to terminate the contract.

Just as there are successful and unsuccessful marriages, so too are there successful and unsuccessful agency-client matches. Successful agency-client relationships, like successful marriages, can last for decades, particularly those based on the "partnership principle" of "openness, collaboration and mutual trust" (Novak 1979). Analogously, poor agency-client relationships also have characteristics of bad marriages. Emotion, ego and uncertainty make agency-client communication and trust difficult (Zelter 1984) and procrastination, "dullness" and reluctance to take chances, three elements in the profile of a "bad" client (Kingman 1981), hinder the productivity of the relationship.

The Pre-Relationship Phase

Much of the work on the agency-client relationship to date has focused on the pre-relationship phase, the period in which an advertiser chooses an agency. This agency search can result from structural changes in the client

organization which necesssitate the hiring of an agency or dissatisfaction with the current agency (Weilbacher 1983; Morgan 1974). While there are systematic, routinized procedures which clients can follow to select agencies (Weilbacher 1983; Newsome 1980; Morgan 1974), some clients do not thoroughly investigate the range of agency prospects and instead, simply select agencies that mirror their personality and existing strengths rather than provide complementary services and strengths. This generally leads to less productive working relationships (Chevalier & Catry 1976).

The Maintenance Phase

Literature on the maintenance phase of the agency-client relationship has tended to focus on two particular aspects: inventories of factors that make the relationship productive or unproductive (Brown 1983; Chevalier & Catry 1976; Hotz, Ryans & Shanklin 1982; Krugman & Farrell 1981; Weilbacher 1981) or the role of agency reviews/audits in maintaining agency-client satisfaction (Novak 1979; Prentice 1983; Ryan & Colley 1967).

The consensus from the various studies on factors that influence agency-client productivity is that no one single factor is determinant; many factors influence productivity (Weilbacher 1981). In a national study of American mid-sized agencies, Brown (1983) found that only fifteen percent of agencies responding thought their clients were extremely satisfied with the agency. He also found that research was considered to be a very important agency service by those agencies that said their clients were very satisfied.

Hotz, Ryans and Shanklin (1982) interviewed twenty-eight agency and thirty-nine client executives and found that agencies and clients disagree regarding the causes of agency-client conflict. Clients tended to criticize lack of cost-consciousness on the part of agencies, while agencies tended to criticize lack of clear-cut objectives on the part of clients. Yet both

agency and client respondents tended to recognize poor communication by the client and too many levels of approval in the client organization as frequent sources of conflict.

Krugman and Ferrell (1981) also found differences in perceptions of agency and client personnel, and found that clients perceived agencies to have lower ethical standards on such topics as: claiming credit for someone else's work; falsifying time reports; padding expense accounts; and taking longer than necessary to do a job. The authors concluded that "when analyzing the behaviors where mutual trust and respect may be most important in the exchange relationship, clients do not rate agencies as well as agencies rate clients. The relationship is always in this direction."

This tendency to blame the other partner is a common theme in several studies (Krugman & Ferrell 1981; Zelter 1984; Doyle, Corstjens & Michell 1980) with one study finding agencies more critical of clients than of themselves (Weilbacher 1981), and has been explained as a dissonance-reducing strategy on the part of both agencies and clients who seek to rationalize the failure of the relationship (Doyle, Corstjens & Michell 1980).

Several researchers have noted the usefulness of agency reviews as a means of shortcircuiting agency or client disenchantment (Novak 1979; Prentice 1983; Ryan & Colley 1967). While there is an increasing trend toward using quantifiable evaluation techniques, they often do not take place until the relationship has neared the breaking point—too late to make objective recommendations for improving the relationship (Ryan & Colley 1967). Further, the use of reviews per se may not prevent agency or client dissatisfaction, particularly if the reviews are simplistic or lack objectivity (Prentice 1983).

The Termination Phase

Finally, several studies have been conducted to examine the causes of termination of the agency-client relationship. In a study of United Kingdom advertisers and their former agencies, Doyle, Corstjens and Michell (1980) found that although agencies and clients tended to blame each other for the actual cause of relationship problems, there were some key signs that signalled an imminent change in the relationship. These factors included a change in the top management of the client organization, a sense that a client had "outgrown" the agency through internal development or merger, a change in client marketing philosophy or strategies, or a change in agency growth or acquisition of new, competing accounts (see also Weilbacher, 1983). In other words, both parties enter the relationship at a certain stage in development, but when each changes, the relationship must be flexible enough to change accordingly or it will be terminated.

In addition to these structural and issue changes on either the agency or client side, personal or maintenance factors also play an important role in disrupting the agency-client relationship. For example, Heekin (1983) argues that the majority of agency firings are based on people-related reasons versus performance-related reasons. These "people" reasons include: arrogance, an inability to listen, preoccupation with landing new accounts, frequent personnel changes and an intangible problem in "chemistry." In his studies, Heekin has found that agencies were fired just as often when sales were going up as well as going down. Similarly, Raphael (1981) claims that far more accounts are lost for personal or political reasons than for inferior agency performance. That is, neither the inherent abilities of the agency nor the success of the agency effort may be as important as the quality of the day-to-day links between agency and client account personnel (Chevalier & Catry 1976;

Heekin 1983).

Research Questions

What is most compelling in summarizing these research findings is the variety of factors that impinge to form a satisfactory or unsatisfactory relationship. But in terms of the conceptual framework introduced in this paper, maintenance issues clearly seem to be at least as important as task issues in influencing the productivity of the relationship. Thus, the first research question is to assess the relative importance of task and maintenance issues on the clients' satisfaction with the agency.

Further, certain structural client charactertistics seem to be particularly important in the maintenance of a productive relationship. For example, differences in advertising budgets and needs will affect the agency-selection decision; small accounts are usually placed with small agencies where the client can get more attention than he would from a large agency where the client would be lost among larger accounts (Newsome 1980). Thus, features of the agency that might be important to smaller clients might not be as important to clients who have larger advertising budgets and are in a position to choose from more agencies (Chevalier & Catry 1976). This raises the second research question, namely, what effect do differences in company size and advertising budget have in altering the relative importance of task and maintenance factors?

A third research question involves the satisfaction of a client with agency performance as a function of client input in the agency-selection decision. The intangible chemistry between key account personnel is an important factor in the success of the relationship. Where an account manager in the client organization controls the hiring decision, there is a greater probability that this chemistry will be favorable; where others have made the

hiring decision, the chemistry problem is more likely to surface.

Finally, this study addresses the role of agency reviews in client satisfaction with the agency. While agency reviews are becoming more common, the mere scheduling of reviews is not expected to, in itself, result in greater satisfaction with the agency.

Methodology

To investigate these research questions, 300 questionnaires were mailed to Midwestern advertisers listed in the Standard Directory of Advertisers. One hundred and eighty-two questionnaires were returned, for a response rate of 61 percent.

The questionnaire was routed to the person having the closest contact with the firm's advertising agency. A one-dollar bill was enclosed as an incentive to complete the questionnaire.

Measurement

The questionnaire contained a mixture of open-ended and Likert items designed to assess clients' satisfaction with their advertising agency. The first four items concerned characteristics of the respondent and the client organization itself, including the respondent's position, the type of company, its annual sales and advertising budget.

In the next section, respondents were asked to appraise the success of their agency on a variety of factors adapted from an inventory derived by Weilbacher (1981). Thirteen factors that concerned task issues and five factors concerning maintenance issues were included in the inventory (see Table 1).

In addition, respondents were asked questions regarding their overall satisfaction with their present agency, how they heard about the present

agency before it was selected, how often agency reviews were conducted, and the billing system used by the agency.

Importance ratings. In order to determine the relative importance of various factors in affecting the client's satisfaction with the agency, importance rating scores were calculated through a procedure similar to that employed by Brown (1983), and combined overall evaluations of satisfaction with the agency with evaluations of the success of the agency in handling the eighteen specific factors listed in Table 1.

The rationale used for the procedure was as follows. If a respondent is satisfied with the agency, and the agency is not successful in accomplishing some specific task or maintenance issue, then that factor is not of great importance to the advertiser. Similarly, if the respondent is not satisfied with the agency, yet the agency is successful in accomplishing a specific factor, then again, this factor is not of great importance to the advertiser. Conversely, if the respondent is satisfied with the agency's performance and the agency is successful in accomplishing a specific factor, then the factor may be of importance to the advertiser.

These importance ratings for each of the eighteen issue and maintenance factors ranged from 13 to 52, with a high score indicating that respondents who were satisfied with their agency tended to also rate their agency as successful on fulfilling that factor.

Results

Sample Characteristics

Three-quarters of the respondents described their companies as manufacturers, 13 percent as wholesalers and/or retailers, and the remaining 12 percent described their companies as either financial or service. Half of

the respondents described their position as being in either advertising or sales promotion, with nearly 30 percent in marketing, 8 percent being either the president or owner, 4 percent in sales and the remaining 8 percent in "multiple label" positions--marketing and sales or advertising and public relations.

Thirty-seven percent of the respondents reported their company's annual sales at over $100 million, with 26 percent having annual sales of $25-99 million, 25 percent with sales of $5-24 million and 8 percent reporting sales of under $5 million.

In terms of annual advertising/promotion budgets, 36 percent of the respondents reported budgets of $1 million or more, 10 percent with budgets of $500,000-999,999, 11 percent with budgets of $250,000-499,999, 23 percent with budgets of $100,000-249,999 and 18 percent under $100,000.

Fifty-five percent of the respondents reported that their agency billing system was based on a combination of commission and fee basis, while the remaining 45 percent were almost equally divided beweeen straight commission and straight fee.

Overall, only 49 percent of the respondents indicated that they were either very or somewhat satisfied with their present agency. Fifty-one percent said they were either not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the agency. The proportion of dissatisfied respondents is quite high, particularly when compared to Brown's (1983) study of agency perceptions of client satisfaction. In that study, 99 percent of the agency respondents thought their clients were either reasonably or extremely satisfied. The present results, when combined with those of Brown, again underscore the lack of understanding between agency and client.

Importance Ratings

Table 1 lists importance ratings of the eighteen evaluation factors. Significantly, three maintenance factors, good personal relationships with account service personnel; good personal relationship with agency creative people; and agency personel are experienced, received the highest importance ratings. Conversely, two other maintenance issues--easy to get in touch with account executive and agency personnel turnover--received very low importance ratings.

Client Characteristics and Importance Ratings

As previously stated, clients with different resources and problems will have different needs from advertising agencies. To investigate the differences of client characteristics on importance ratings, the client companies were divided into two groups: those with annual sales of $50 million or over (referred to as large companies) and those with annual sales of under $50 million (referred to as small companies).

Table 2 shows importance ratings controlling for company size. Importance ratings for large companies showed three maintenance issues--good relationship with account service people, good relationship with creative people and experienced personnel--as receiving the highest ratings. This is the same ordering as occurred in the overall sample.

In small companies, however, ratings of two task issues came out on top--good creative work and strong leadership. In general, four of the five maintenance issues received higher importance ratings from large companies than from small companies. The difference in the order of the ratings was statistically significant, with a Spearman-rho correlation of .73.

Next, the data were analyzed controlling for the size of the advertising

budget. Advertising budgets of $500,000 or more per year were classified as large, while those under $500,000 annually were labeled small (see Table 3).

As was the case with company size, importance ratings from companies with large advertising budgets showed two maintenance factors--good personal relationships with account service and creative people--as most important. Ratings from companies with small advertising budgets had one maintenance issue--experienced personnel--as most important, followed by fairness of charging, a task issue, and good relationship with account service people, another maintenance issue. In general, ratings for companies with large advertising showed greater importance for five of six maintenance issues. The difference in the order of ranking, although less pronounced for advertising budget than for company size, was nonetheless statistically significant, with a Spearman-rho correlation of .38.

Client Choice in Agency Selection

The third research question was whether clients who had input in the choice of the agency would be more satisfied with overall agency performance. Responses to the question, "How did you happen to hear about your present agency before you selected it?" were content analyzed to determine the extent of control the respondent had in the agency selection process. Responses that implied choice included: personal knowledge of the agency; personal relationship with someone in the agency, conducting an extensive search and/or interview process; consideration of the agency's reputation; advice from other executives; or knowledge of previous work done by the agency. Responses implying "no choice" included: the agency was hired prior to the respondent's obtaining a position at the company; or corporate management required the hiring of the agency, e.g., when the main corporate branch was already using the particular agency.

As Table 4 indicates, whereas choice in the agency-selection process has little bearing on the respondents' overall satisfaction with the agency, lack of choice was related to dissatisfaction. The difference is statistically significant at the .05 level using a X^2 test.

Agency Review and Satisfaction

Companies with large advertising budgets are more likely to conduct agency reviews on a regular basis than are small companies (see Table 5). The difference is statistically significant at the .01 level.

Further, 67 percent of the companies with small advertising budgets versus 48 percent of the companies with large advertising budgets conduct agency reviews on a regular basis (see Table 6).

Despite these differences in scheduling agency reviews, there is no statistically significant difference in respondents' overall satisfaction with the agency and the frequency of agency reviews (see Table 7). This finding holds up controlling for companies with large and small advertising budgets.

Conclusion

The agency-client relationship is first and foremost a relationship. As such, it can be examined in terms of a relationship-theory framework. The perspective adopted in this paper is that all relationships involve task issues and maintenance issues, and that both must be addressed if the relationship is to be successful and productive. Further, all relationships go through a natural progression of a pre-relationship phase, maintenance and termination.

This study of 182 midwestern advertisers has examined the maintenance phase of the relationship by examining the relative importance of various task

and maintenance issues to advertisers. The findings show a surprisingly large proportion of advertisers dissatisfied with their agencies, particularly in light of Brown's (1983) finding that agencies perceive that 99 percent of their clients are either reasonably or extremely satisfied with their agency.

The findings show strong support for the importance of maintenance issues--what Heeklns (1983) calls people-related reasons and what Chevalier and Catry (1976) term the every-day status of the links between the two partners.

In addition, company size and advertising budget influence importance ratings of maintenance and task issues. Companies with smaller advertising budgets--those who must be particularly careful to get the most efficient results for their dollars--are more concerned with the success of the agency in handling task issues such as creative work or research. Companies with larger budgets, who perhaps have the luxury of choosing from a wider array of advertising agencies and perhaps have more extensive in-house services, are more concerned with maintenance or relationship issues.

Agency choice is also a significant factor in a client's satisfaction with an agency. This implies that the account manager should be permitted to have input in the choice of the agency, and that relationship problems might arise when a new account manager is hired to work with the present advertising agency.

Finally, the data indicate that regularly scheduled agency reviews are more often carried out by companies with large rather than small advertising budgets. Because agency reviews require funding to complete, this result is not unexpected, although it has not previously been documented. But more importantly, the regular scheduling of reviews will not ensure satisfaction with the advertising agency. If adequately designed and objectively conducted at regular intervals, reviews may provide indicators of changes in the

philosophy or structure of either party that may lead to problems in the relationship. But if the relationship is not flexible enough to accommodate these changes once they are uncovered, the relationship will become unsatisfactory and eventually be terminated.

Table 1.--Eighteen factors in order of importance to advertisers (Most important to least)

Factors	Difference Score
Good personal relationship with account service people (maintenance).....	52
Good personal relationship with agency creative people (maintenance).....	47
Agency personnel are experienced (maintenance).....	44
Agency shows strong leadership (task).	43
Agency operates within agreed upon strategies (task).....	40
Agency meetings are productive and efficient (task).....	37
Agency charges fairly (task).....	36
Good use of research (task).....	32
Good creative work (task).....	29
Agency is not burdened with too many approval levels (task).....	27
Agency stays within budget limitations (task).....	24
Agency has a good public relations department (task).....	24
Agency reacts quickly (task).....	22
Agency makes deadlines (task).....	21
Easy to get in touch with account executive and other essential people (maintenance).....	20
Assignment of responsibilities clear (task)	17
Agency has low personnel turnover (maintenance).....	13

Table 2.--Eighteen factors rated according to importance to advertisers, controlling for volume of sales (The order--number one being the most important--is indicated in parenthesis behind score.)

Factors	Difference Score	
	Small Companies	Large Companies
Good relationship with account service people.....	47 (4)	55 (1)
Good relationship with agency creative people.....	35 (9)	54 (2)
Agency personnel are experienced	48 (3)	40 (3)
Agency shows strong leadership	49 (2)	33 (6)
Agency operates within agreed upon strategies.....	38 (7)	32 (8)
Agency meetings are productive and efficient.....	39 (6)	34 (5)
Agency charges fairly.....	44 (5)	28 (9)
Good use of research.....	38 (7)	26 (11)
Good creative work.....	59 (1)	39 (4)
Agency not burdened with too many approval levels.....	28 (11)	33 (6)
Agency stays within budget limits	31 (10)	20 (13)
Agency is full-service.....	13 (18)	27 (10)
Agency has p.r. department.....	22 (13)	20 (13)
Agency reacts quickly.....	26 (12)	9 (17)
Agency makes deadlines.....	21 (14)	18 (15)
Easy to get in touch with account executive, other essential people.....	15 (16)	21 (12)
Assignment of responsibilities clear	17 (15)	15 (16)
Agency has low personnel turnover	15 (16)	9 (17)

Spearman-rho correlation=.73

Table 3.--Eighteen factors rated according to importance to advertisers, controlling for volume of advertising budget (The order--number one being most important--is indicated in parenthesis.)

Factors	Difference Score	
	Small Companies	Large Companies
Good relationship with account service people.....	48 (3)	57 (1)
Good relationship with agency creative people.....	43 (6)	51 (2)
Agency personnel are experienced	53 (1)	36 (6)
Agency shows strong leadership..	47 (4)	40 (4)
Agency operates within agreed upon strategies.....	46 (5)	34 (7)
Agency meetings are productive and efficient.....	34 (8)	40 (4)
Agency charges fairly.....	49 (2)	21 (15)
Good use of research.....	35 (7)	28 (12)
Good creative work.....	32 (9)	33 (8)
Agency not burdened with too many approval levels.....	27 (12)	42 (3)
Agency stays within budget limits	24 (14)	29 (9)
Agency is full-service.....	29 (10)	13 (18)
Agency has p.r. department.....	27 (12)	23 (14)
Agency reacts quickly.....	29 (10)	16 (16)
Agency makes deadlines.....	23 (15)	25 (13)
Easy to get in touch with account executive, other essential people.....	16 (16)	29 (9)
Assignment of responsibilities clear	5 (18)	29 (9)
Agency has low personnel turnover	15 (17)	16 (16)

Spearman-rho correlations=.38

Table 4.--Advertisers' satisfaction with the overall performance of their ad agency by choice in agency selection

	Choice	No Choice
Satisfied	51%	31%
Dissatisfied	49%	69%
	100%	100%
	n=107	n=45

x^2=5.26, $p < .05$

Table 5.—Scheduling of agency review by volume of advertising budget

	Advertising Budget	
	Small	Large
Haphazard	66%	43%
Scheduled	34%	57%
	100%	100%
	n=91	n=83

x^2=8.93, $p < .01$

Table 6.--Frequency of agency reviews by volume of advertising budget

	Advertising Budget	
	Small	Large
Only when needed.....	67%	43%
Once every 3 to 5 years or less.....	6%	7%
Once every 1 to 2 years	24%	31%
More than once a year...	3%	19%
	100%	100%
	n=90	n=84

x^2=15.14, p .01

Table 7.--Advertisers' satisfaction with their agency's performance by the scheduling of reviews.

	Reviews	
	Scheduled	Haphazard
Satisfied	51%	47%
Dissatisfied	49%	53%
	100%	100%
	n=76	n=95

x^2=.26,n.s.

Table 8.--Advertisers' satisfaction with their agency's performance by the scheduling of reviews-small advertising budgets

	Small Advertising Budget	
	Scheduled	Haphazard
Satisfied	50%	44%
Dissatisfied	50%	56%
	100%	100%
	n=30	n=59

x^2=.27,n.s.

Table 9.--Advertisers' satisfaction with their agency's performance by the scheduling of reviews: large advertising budgets

	Large Advertising Budget	
	Scheduled	Haphazard
Satisfied	52%	53%
Dissatisfied	48%	47%
	100%	100%
	n=44	n=36

x^2=0,n.s.

References

Argyris, C. (1968) "Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness," in Interpersonal Dynamics, edited by W. Bennis, E.H. Schein, F. I Steele & D.E. Berlew, Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1968.

Bennis, W.G., E.H. Schein, F.I. Steele & D.E. Berlew, eds., (1968) Interpersonal Dynamics, Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1968.

Brown, J.D. (1983) "Satisfaction: Easy to Promise, Hard to Deliver," Advertising Age, (4 April), M48-50.

Chevalier, M. and B. Catry (1976) "Advertising in France: The Advertiser-Advertising Agency Relationship," European Journal of Marketing, 10, 28-34.

Cummings, B.A. (1973) "Full Service Agencies vs. A la Carte," Journal of Advertising, 2, 12-15.

Doyle, P., M. Coustjens and P. Michell (1980) "Signals of Vulnerability in Agency-Client Relations," Journal of Marketing, 44, 18-23.

Garfield, M.S. (1981) "The Fallacies of Giantism," Advertising Age, (1 June), 51-52.

Heekin, J.R. (1983) "Why Advertising Agencies Lose Accounts," unpublished manuscript.

Hotz, M.R., J.K Ryans, Jr., and W.L. Shanklin (1982) "Agency/Client Relationships as Seen by Influentials on Both Sides," Journal of Advertising, 11, 37-44.

Kingman, M. (1981) "A Profile of the Bad Client," Advertising Age, (11 May), 49-52.

Krugman, D.M. and O.C. Ferrell (1981) "The Organizational Ethics of Advertising: Corporate and Agency Views," Journal of Advertising, 10, 21-30.

Morgan, E.A. (1974) Choosing and Using Advertising Agencies, London: Business Books.

Newsome, J.E. (1980) "A Basis for Partnership: Choosing an Advertising Agency," Advertising Magazine, #66, (Winter), 26-28.

Novak, G. (1979) "Reviews Slow Agency Changes," Advertising Age, (2 July), 36.

Prentice, R. M. (1983) "How Not to Evaluate an Agency," Marketing and Media Decisions, (January) 78-82.

Raphael, G.M. (1981) "Job Hazard: Cold Fear in the Agency Business," Advertising Age, (1 June) 58.

Ryan, M.P. and R.H. Colley (1967) "Preventive Maintenance in Client-Ad Agency Relations," Harvard Business Review, (September-October) 45, 66-74.

Salmon, C.T. (1984) "Agency-Client Match Requires More Than a Shotgun Wedding," Atlanta Business Chronicle, (27 February), 10.

Weilbacher, W.M. (1981) Auditing Productivity: Advertiser-Agency Relationships Can Be Improved, Association of National Advertisers, Inc.

---------- (1983) Choosing an Advertising Agency, Chicago: Crain Books.

Zelter, H. (1984) "Client-Agency Conflicts," Advertising Age, (5 March), M64.